



# **Annual Report on Contractor Work Force Restructuring**

**U.S. Department of Energy**

**Fiscal Year 2005**

**September 2006**

**ANNUAL REPORT  
ON CONTRACTOR  
WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING**

**FISCAL YEAR 2005**

Office of Legacy Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
September 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	iv
List of Acronyms and Short Titles .....	v
<b>Section 1: Overview</b> .....	1-1
1.1 Introduction .....	1-1
1.2 Summary of Fiscal Year 2005 Activities .....	1-2
1.3 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 .....	1-3
1.3.1 Sec. 3161. Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Facilities Work Force Restructuring Plan .....	1-3
1.3.2 Sec. 3163. Definitions .....	1-4
1.4 Listing of Defense Nuclear Facilities .....	1-6
<b>Section 2: Summary of Work Force Restructuring</b> .....	2-1
2.1 Background .....	2-1
2.2 Fiscal Year 2005 Work Force Restructuring Activity .....	2-1
2.3 Mitigating Restructuring Impacts .....	2-2
2.4 Community Transition Overview .....	2-3
<b>Section 3: Defense Nuclear Sites</b> .....	3-1
3.1 Background .....	3-1
3.2 Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-1
3.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-1
3.4 Mitigating Restructuring Impacts .....	3-1
3.5 Site Summaries .....	3-2
3.5.1 Argonne National Laboratory .....	3-2
3.5.1.1 Background .....	3-2
3.5.1.2 Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-2
3.5.1.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-3
3.5.2 Brookhaven National Laboratory .....	3-4
3.5.2.1 Background .....	3-4
3.5.2.2 Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-4
3.5.2.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-4
3.5.3 Fernald and Mound .....	3-5
3.5.3.1 Background .....	3-5
3.5.3.2 Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-5
3.5.3.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-6
3.5.3.4 Community Transition .....	3-7
3.5.4 Hanford Site .....	3-9
3.5.4.1 Background .....	3-9
3.5.4.2 Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-9
3.5.4.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-10
3.5.4.4 Community Transition .....	3-10
3.5.5 Idaho National Laboratory .....	3-12
3.5.5.1 Background .....	3-12
3.5.5.2 Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-12
3.5.5.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-12
3.5.5.4 Community Transition .....	3-12
3.5.6 Kansas City Plant .....	3-14
3.5.6.1 Background .....	3-14
3.5.6.2 Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-14
3.5.6.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-15

3.5.7	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.....	3-16
3.5.7.1	Background.....	3-16
3.5.7.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-16
3.5.7.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-16
3.5.8	Los Alamos National Laboratory.....	3-17
3.5.8.1	Background.....	3-17
3.5.8.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-17
3.5.8.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-17
3.5.8.4	Community Transition.....	3-17
3.5.9	Nevada Test Site.....	3-19
3.5.9.1	Background.....	3-19
3.5.9.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-19
3.5.9.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-20
3.5.9.4	Community Transition.....	3-20
3.5.10	Oak Ridge Complex .....	3-22
3.5.10.1	Background.....	3-22
3.5.10.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-22
3.5.10.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-23
3.5.10.4	Community Transition.....	3-23
3.5.11	Paducah and Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plants .....	3-24
3.5.11.1	Background.....	3-24
3.5.11.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-24
3.5.11.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-26
3.5.11.4	Community Transition.....	3-27
3.5.12	Pantex Plant.....	3-29
3.5.12.1	Background.....	3-29
3.5.12.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-29
3.5.12.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-29
3.5.13	Pinellas Plant.....	3-30
3.5.13.1	Community Transition.....	3-30
3.5.14	Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site .....	3-31
3.5.14.1	Background.....	3-31
3.5.14.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-31
3.5.14.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-32
3.5.14.3	Community Transition.....	3-32
3.5.15	Sandia National Laboratories .....	3-33
3.5.15.1	Background.....	3-33
3.5.15.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-33
3.5.15.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-33
3.5.15.4	Community Transition.....	3-33
3.5.16	Savannah River Site .....	3-36
3.5.16.1	Background.....	3-36
3.5.16.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-36
3.5.16.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-38
3.5.16.4	Community Transition.....	3-38
3.5.17	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.....	3-39
3.5.17.1	Background.....	3-39
3.5.17.2	Current Work Force Restructuring .....	3-39
3.5.17.3	Work Force Restructuring Cost .....	3-39
3.5.17.4	Community Transition.....	3-39

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1.	Defense Nuclear Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	2-2
Table 2-2.	Summary of Community Transition Funding and Job Creation Statistics, Fiscal Years 1993-2005.....	2-4
Table 3-1.	Argonne National Laboratory Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-3
Table 3-2.	Brookhaven National Laboratory Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-4
Table 3-3.	Fernald Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-5
Table 3-4.	Mound Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-6
Table 3-5.	Fernald Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-7
Table 3-6.	Mound Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-8
Table 3-7.	Hanford Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-10
Table 3-8.	Hanford Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-11
Table 3-9.	Idaho National Laboratory Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-13
Table 3-10.	Kansas City Plant Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-15
Table 3-11.	Los Alamos National Laboratory Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project .....	3-18
Table 3-12.	Nevada Test Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005.....	3-20
Table 3-13.	Nevada Test Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-21
Table 3-14.	Oak Ridge Complex Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-22
Table 3-15.	Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project .....	3-23
Table 3-16.	Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-25
Table 3-17.	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-26
Table 3-18.	Paducah Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-27
Table 3-19.	Portsmouth Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-28
Table 3-20.	Pinellas Plant Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project .....	3-30
Table 3-21.	Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-31
Table 3-22.	Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project .....	3-32
Table 3-23.	Albuquerque Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project .....	3-34
Table 3-24.	Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council Community Reuse Organization Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-35
Table 3-25.	Savannah River Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005 .....	3-37
Table 3-26.	Savannah River Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project .....	3-38
Table 3-27.	Carlsbad Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project.....	3-40

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS AND SHORT TITLES**

Argonne	Argonne National Laboratory (Illinois)
Brookhaven	Brookhaven National Laboratory (New York)
Coalition	Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments
COBRA	Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985
CRO	community reuse organization
CROET	Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EICRO	Eastern Idaho Community Reuse Organization
ENIPC	Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council, Inc.
Fernald	Fernald Closure Project (Ohio)
FM&T	Federal Manufacturing & Technologies
FY	fiscal year (October 1 – September 30)
Hanford	Hanford Site (Washington State)
KCP	Kansas City Plant
LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory (New Mexico)
LLC	limited liability company
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (California and Nevada)
LM	Office of Legacy Management (U.S. Department of Energy)
MMCIC	Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation
Mound	Mound Closure Project (Ohio)
NextGen	Next-Generation Economy, Inc.
NNSA	National Nuclear Security Administration
NTS	Nevada Test Site (Nevada)
NTSDC	Nevada Test Site Development Corporation
ORP	Office of River Protection (U.S. Department of Energy)
PACRO	Paducah-Area Community Reuse Organization
Paducah	Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Kentucky)
Pantex	Pantex Plant (Texas)
Portsmouth	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Ohio)
RDA	Regional Development Alliance, Inc.
RDC	Regional Development Corporation
RFETS	Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (Colorado)
RIF	reduction in force (separations) = total separations minus attrition
RL	Richland Operations Office (U.S. Department of Energy)

Sandia	Sandia National Laboratories (California and New Mexico)
section 3161	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, section 3161
SODI	Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative
SRRDI	Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative
SRS	Savannah River Site (South Carolina)
Stat.	<i>United States Statutes at Large</i>
TRIDEC	Tri-City Industrial Development Council
TRU	transuranic
U.S.C.	<i>United States Code</i>
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (New Mexico)

## **SECTION 1: OVERVIEW**

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

The mission of the Office of Legacy Management (LM), established in December 2003, is to manage U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) post-closure responsibilities and ensure protection of human health and the environment. LM supports an effective work force structure to accomplish DOE missions by providing for continuity and delivery of contract worker post-closure pension and medical benefits.

In fiscal year (FY) 2005, LM supported worker and community transition activities by (1) developing policies and programs necessary to plan for and mitigate impacts of changing conditions on workers and communities affected by DOE mission changes; (2) implementing these policies and programs in a way that ensures fair treatment of all concerned, while recognizing unique site and contract conditions; and (3) assisting communities most affected by changing missions at DOE sites by using DOE resources to stimulate economic development.

LM sets worker and community transition policies consistent with section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (see **Section 1.3**). This legislation requires DOE to develop work force restructuring plans when there are changes in the work force at defense nuclear facilities (see **Section 1.4**) and to mitigate the impact of these changes using a number of methods, including voluntary separation programs, training, relocation, and job placement assistance. Section 3161 also provides for community transition assistance grants designed to mitigate the impact of work force changes and reduce community dependence on DOE activities.

The overall objective of work force restructuring is to ensure that DOE meets its mission requirements and, at the same time, to minimize social and economic impacts of restructuring on both workers and communities surrounding these sites. To this end, LM cooperates with: (1) appropriate field organizations to prepare work force restructuring plans that provide reasonable assistance to affected workers, and (2) affected communities to develop transition plans that address potential economic impacts of restructuring.

This report responds to the section 3161 requirement that DOE report to Congress annually on the work force restructuring results. It covers activities in FY 2005 and serves to update Congress and the public on work force restructuring and community transition outcomes.



## **1.2 SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2005 ACTIVITIES**

### **Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, reduction-in-force separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 3,622 with 831 (22.9 percent) voluntary and 2,791 (77.1 percent) involuntary. An additional 2,513 separations occurred through attrition. The total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$74,335,283.

### **Community Transition**

Since 1993, 15 communities have identified reuse organizations and have applied for funding. Their activities have retained, expanded, or created a total of 42,838 jobs. The average cost per job in the communities surrounding these sites was \$5,732.

### **Organization of Report**

This report is organized into three sections. Section 1 presents an overview of this report. Section 2 summarizes work force restructuring and community transition activities at all sites. Section 3 presents work force restructuring and community transition activities for each defense nuclear site.

The FY 2005 *Annual Report on Contractor Work Force Restructuring* includes DOE defense nuclear sites that (1) underwent a work force restructuring action and/or (2) spent program or section 3161 funds for these work force actions. Only DOE non-defense facilities that spent section 3161 funds on work force restructuring actions were asked to report. In FY 2005, no non-defense DOE facilities spent section 3161 funds on work force restructuring actions; therefore, no non-defense facilities are included in this report.

This report is available on the LM website at <http://www.lm.doe.gov>.

## 1.3 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

(Public Law 102-484, October 23, 1992)

Subtitle E--Defense Nuclear Workers

### 1.3.1 Sec. 3161. Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Facilities Work Force Restructuring Plan

(a) **IN GENERAL.**--Upon determination that a change in the work force at a defense nuclear facility is necessary, the Secretary of Energy (hereinafter in this subtitle referred to as the "Secretary") shall develop a plan for restructuring the work force for the defense nuclear facility that takes into account--

(1) the reconfiguration of the defense nuclear facility; and

(2) the plan for the nuclear weapons stockpile that is the most recently prepared plan at the time of the development of the plan referred to in this subsection.

(b) **Consultation.**--(1) In developing a plan referred to in subsection (a) and any updates of the plan under subsection (e), the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Labor, appropriate representatives of local and national collective-bargaining units of individuals employed at Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities, appropriate representatives of departments and agencies of State and local governments, appropriate representatives of State and local institutions of higher education, and appropriate representatives of community groups in communities affected by the restructuring plan.

(2) The Secretary shall determine appropriate representatives of the units, governments, institutions, and groups referred to in paragraph (1).

(c) **OBJECTIVES.**--In preparing the plan required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall be guided by the following objectives:

(1) Changes in the work force at a Department of Energy defense nuclear facility--

(A) should be accomplished so as to minimize social and economic impacts;

(B) should be made only after the provision of notice of such changes not later than 120 days before the commencement of such changes to such employees and the communities in which such facilities are located; and

(C) should be accomplished, when possible, through the use of retraining, early retirement, attrition, and other options that minimize layoffs.

(2) Employees whose employment in positions at such facilities is terminated shall, to the extent practicable, receive preference in any hiring of the Department of Energy (consistent with applicable employment seniority plans or practices of the Department of Energy and with section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-189; 103 Stat. 1682)).

(3) Employees shall, to the extent practicable, be retrained for work in environmental restoration and waste management activities at such facilities or other facilities of the Department of Energy.

(4) The Department of Energy should provide relocation assistance to employees who are transferred to other Department of Energy facilities as a result of the plan.

(5) The Department of Energy should assist terminated employees in obtaining appropriate retraining, education, and reemployment assistance (including employment placement assistance).

(6) The Department of Energy should provide local impact assistance to communities that are affected by the restructuring plan and coordinate the provision of such assistance with--

(A) programs carried out by the Department of Labor pursuant to the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.);

(B) programs carried out pursuant to the Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization Act of 1990 (Part D of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2391 note); and

(C) programs carried out by the Department of Commerce pursuant to title IX of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3241 et seq.).

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**--The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, work on an ongoing basis with representatives of the Department of Labor, work force bargaining units, and States and local communities in carrying out a plan required under subsection (a).

(e) **PLAN UPDATES.**--Not later than one year after issuing a plan referred to in subsection (a) and on an annual basis thereafter, the Secretary shall issue an update of the plan. Each updated plan under this subsection shall--

(1) be guided by the objectives referred to in subsection (c), taking into account any changes in the function or mission of the Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities and any other changes in circumstances that the Secretary determines to be relevant;

(2) contain an evaluation by the Secretary of the implementation of the plan during the year preceding the report; and

(3) contain such other information and provide for such other matters as the Secretary determines to be relevant.

(f) **SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.**--(1) The Secretary shall submit to Congress a plan referred to in subsection (a) with respect to a defense nuclear facility within 90 days after the date on which a notice of changes described in subsection (c)(1)(B) is provided to employees of the facility, or 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

(2) The Secretary shall submit to Congress any updates of the plan under subsection (e) immediately upon completion of any such update.

### **1.3.2 Sec. 3163. Definitions**

For purposes of this subtitle:

(1) The term "Department of Energy defense nuclear facility" means--

(A) a production facility or utilization facility (as those terms are defined in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014)) that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary and that is operated for national security purposes (including the tritium loading facility at Savannah River, South Carolina, the 236 H

facility at Savannah River, South Carolina; and the Mound Laboratory, Ohio), but the term does not include any facility that does not conduct atomic energy defense activities and does not include any facility or activity covered by Executive Order Number 12344, dated February 1, 1982, pertaining to the naval nuclear propulsion program;

(B) a nuclear waste storage or disposal facility that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary;

(C) a testing and assembly facility that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary and that is operated for national security purposes (including the Nevada Test Site, Nevada, the Pinellas Plant, Florida; and the Pantex facility, Texas);

(D) an atomic weapons research facility that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary (including the Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, and Sandia National Laboratories); or

(E) any facility described in paragraphs (1) through (4) that--

(i) is no longer in operation;

(ii) was under the control or jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, or the Energy Research and Development Administration; and

(iii) was operated for national security purposes.

(2) The term "Department of Energy employee" means any employee of the Department of Energy defense nuclear facility, including any employee of a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Energy employed at such a facility.

## **1.4 LISTING OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES**

The list below reflects facilities receiving funding for DOE atomic energy defense activities, with the exception of activities under the Naval Reactor Propulsion Program. These facilities have varying degrees of defense activities, ranging from total defense dedication to a small portion of their overall activity.

Argonne National Laboratory (Illinois)  
Brookhaven National Laboratory (New York)  
East Tennessee Technology Park (Tennessee)  
Fernald Closure Project (Ohio)  
Hanford Site (Washington State)  
Idaho National Laboratory (Idaho)  
Kansas City Plant (Missouri)  
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (California and Nevada)  
Los Alamos National Laboratory (New Mexico)  
Mound Closure Project (Ohio)  
Nevada Test Site (Nevada)  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory (Tennessee)  
Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Kentucky)  
Pantex Plant (Texas)  
Pinellas Plant (Florida)  
Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Ohio)  
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (Colorado)  
Sandia National Laboratories (California and New Mexico)  
Savannah River Site (South Carolina)  
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (New Mexico)  
Y-12 National Nuclear Security Administration Complex (Tennessee)

## SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING

### 2.1 BACKGROUND

After World War II, onset of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union led to buildup of the nuclear weapons complex, an elaborate network of research, production, and testing facilities. To meet nuclear weapons production requirements and other national security obligations, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and its predecessor agencies assembled an extensive contractor work force. The breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991, together with President George H.W. Bush's announcement of the first unilateral nuclear weapons reduction agreement on September 27, 1991, signaled the end of the Cold War and dramatically reduced need for further nuclear weapons production.

The end of the Cold War also brought about fundamental changes in contractor work force requirements as DOE shifted from weapons production to other missions, such as environmental management, weapons dismantlement, and science and technology research. Faced with significant budget reductions and overstaffing issues, DOE began to restructure its work force.

During President George H.W. Bush's administration, Secretary of Energy James Watkins issued DOE Order 3309.1A (now incorporated into DOE Order 350.1) establishing specific objectives to ensure fairness while reducing the contractor work force, including programs to minimize layoffs. In passing section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484), Congress mandated an explicit planning process involving affected stakeholders for all work force changes at defense nuclear facilities and directed that the plans be guided by a fundamental objective: to mitigate impacts on workers and communities, especially those whose service had helped maintain our nuclear deterrent force during the Cold War.

Section 3161 requires the Secretary of Energy to develop a plan for restructuring the work force for a defense nuclear facility whenever there is a determination that a change in the work force is necessary. This section also identifies objectives that each plan should address, including minimizing social and economic impacts; giving workers adequate notice of impending changes; minimizing involuntary separations; offering preference in hiring to the extent practicable to those employees involuntarily separated; providing relocation assistance under certain conditions; providing retraining, as well as educational and outplacement assistance; and providing local impact assistance to affected communities.

In response to challenges posed by changing missions, and consistent with DOE policy to apply the work force restructuring process at all sites undergoing significant work force changes, the Office of Worker and Community Transition was established in 1994. This office was assigned responsibility for reviewing and evaluating work force restructuring plans from all sites and overseeing implementation of work force restructuring consistent with these plans and DOE policy and guidance. In December 2003, all Office of Worker and Community Transition functions and responsibilities were merged into the Office of Legacy Management.

### 2.2 FISCAL YEAR 2005 WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING ACTIVITY

**Separations.** A total of 3,622 management contractor team employees were separated from DOE as a result of reduction-in-force actions (total separations minus attrition). (Note: "Management contractor team" consists of prime contractors performing defense and certain non-defense work that historically was done under a management and operating contract. At some sites, subcontractors are also included.) An additional 2,513 separations occurred through attrition. Of the reduction-in-force separations, 22.9 percent were voluntary and 77.1 percent involuntary (**Table 2-1**).

**Table 2–1. Defense Nuclear Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>3,344</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$21,465,947</b>	<b>\$21,465,947</b>	<b>\$6,419</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	831	0	21,465,947	21,465,947	25,831
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	2,513	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>2,791</b>	<b>7,352</b>	<b>46,606,531</b>	<b>46,613,883</b>	<b>16,701</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	2,266	7,352	46,606,531	46,613,883	20,571
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	2,255	0	46,584,531	46,584,531	20,658
2.1.2 Construction workers	11	7,352	22,000	29,352	2,668
2.2 Without benefits	525	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>6,135</b>	<b>7,352</b>	<b>68,072,478</b>	<b>68,079,830</b>	<b>11,097</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	647	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	129	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>2,429</b>	<b>2,690,552</b>	<b>3,564,901</b>	<b>6,255,453</b>	<b>2,575</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	813	24,408	3,546,301	3,570,709	4,392
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	35	100,255	0	100,255	2,864
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	1,205	1,960,300	18,600	1,978,900	1,642
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	376	605,589	0	605,589	1,611
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>9,340</b>	<b>\$2,697,904</b>	<b>\$71,637,379</b>	<b>\$74,335,283</b>	<b>\$7,959</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

**Cost.** The total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$74,335,283 (Table 2–1).

**Enhanced Benefits.** To comply with section 304 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (and succeeding years), separation costs have been broken out by enhanced benefits, which have been paid by the Office of Legacy Management, and program benefits, which have been paid by the responsible program office.

## 2.3 MITIGATING RESTRUCTURING IMPACTS

DOE employs a number of measures to mitigate work force restructuring impacts, especially involuntary separation impacts. These include placing at-risk workers in other positions and transferring workers to other sites with available positions created by changing missions or attrition. Additionally, sites can offer displaced workers medical benefits, relocation assistance, a variety of outplacement services, and educational assistance.

***Displaced Worker Medical Benefits.*** In 1992, Secretary of Energy James Watkins directed that all prime contractor employees separated from DOE sites and not otherwise eligible for another medical program would be eligible for displaced worker medical benefits. Under this program, employees continue to participate in their former employer's medical program, but at a cost to the participant that increases over time. During the first year, the participant contributes the same amount as when employed by the contractor. In the second year, the employee pays one-half the applicable Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (COBRA) rate. In the third and subsequent years, the employee pays the full COBRA rate.

***Relocation Assistance.*** DOE offered relocation assistance to separated prime contractor employees to help them relocate to jobs at other DOE sites where such costs are not normally reimbursed.

***Outplacement Services.*** All DOE facilities included in this report have access to outplacement services to assist separated employees in finding new employment either within or outside DOE. Some sites use consultants or subcontractors to provide such services, while others use in-house contractor staff. Some centers are staffed with job counselors, state employment services personnel, and employee assistance counselors to help separated employees locate possible new employment, prepare resumes, and accommodate personal and family concerns resulting from their separations.

***Educational Assistance.*** Employees, whether voluntarily or involuntarily separated, were often eligible to receive financial assistance of up to \$10,000 per employee over a 4-year period.

## **2.4 COMMUNITY TRANSITION OVERVIEW**

DOE's community transition program is designed to minimize social and economic impacts of work force restructuring on communities surrounding DOE facilities. The program encourages affected communities to chart their own economic future through creation of community reuse organizations, similar to the U.S. Department of Defense's Local Reuse Authorities, created to assist communities affected by military base closures.

***Current Funding Activities and Job Creation.*** Since fiscal year (FY) 1993, a total of \$259,990,260 has been committed complex-wide to 15 communities. As of September 30, 2005, \$245,550,884 was spent on community transition activities which helped to create or retain 42,838 jobs at an average cost of \$5,732 per job. (Table 2-2).



**Table 2–2. Summary of Community Transition Funding and Job Creation Statistics,  
Fiscal Years 1993–2005**

Site	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
Albuquerque	\$2,909,031	\$0	\$2,909,031	\$2,909,031	689	\$4,222
Carlsbad	4,156,000	243,314	4,399,314	3,942,925	1,496	2,636
ENIPC	672,716	0	672,716	672,716	0	0
Fernald	736,921	0	736,921	736,921	0	0
Idaho <sup>a</sup>	7,575,000	0	7,575,000	7,575,000	3,562	2,127
Los Alamos	12,826,206	860,381	13,686,587	13,589,757	1,700	7,994
Mound	25,989,432	750,000	26,739,432	20,408,303	608	33,566
Nevada	15,237,891	632,417	15,870,308	15,870,308	2,728	5,818
Oak Ridge	58,289,500	0	58,289,500	58,289,500	8,924	6,532
Paducah	10,350,000	0	10,350,000	10,198,376	1,722	5,922
Pinellas	26,117,600	100,000	26,217,600	22,600,300	3,321	6,805
Portsmouth	14,519,000	0	14,519,000	12,497,407	1,332	9,382
Richland	22,964,216	132,000	23,096,216	21,909,138	10,247	2,138
Rocky Flats	1,300,000	0	1,300,000	1,300,000	0	0
Savannah River	22,671,325	30,957,310	53,628,635	53,051,202	6,509	8,150
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$226,314,838</b>	<b>\$33,675,422</b>	<b>\$259,990,260</b>	<b>\$245,550,884</b>	<b>42,838</b>	<b>\$5,732</b>

**Key:** CRO=community reuse organization; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; ENIPC=Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council, Inc.

<sup>a</sup> Funds committed and spent reflect only those funds allocated to the Eastern Idaho CRO and its successor, the Regional Development Alliance CRO. DOE provided an additional \$30 million to the state for economic development activities through a federal-court-mandated settlement agreement between DOE and the state on the disposition of spent nuclear fuel. To date \$21 million has been spent.

## SECTION 3: DEFENSE NUCLEAR SITES

### 3.1 BACKGROUND

Work force restructuring data are shown for defense nuclear sites that (1) underwent a work force restructuring action and/or (2) spent funds (program or section 3161) for any work force restructuring activity during fiscal year (FY) 2005. This includes funds spent during FY 2005 for any prior-year work force restructuring activities.

### 3.2 CURRENT WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING

In FY 2005, reduction-in-force (RIF) separations (total separations minus attrition) numbered 3,622, with 831 voluntary and 2,791 involuntary. An additional 2,513 separations occurred through attrition (Table 2-1).

### 3.3 WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING COST

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$74,335,283.

### 3.4 MITIGATING RESTRUCTURING IMPACTS

**Placement.** In FY 2005, 776 workers were placed in other positions, either at the same site or other sites. The majority of these workers were placed at their same site without retraining.

**Displaced Worker Medical Benefits.** In FY 2005, 813 workers took extended displaced worker medical benefits at an average cost of \$4,392. Recipients may have separated in prior years.

**Relocation Assistance.** In FY 2005, 35 workers received relocation assistance at an average cost of \$2,864. Recipients may have separated in prior years.

**Outplacement Services.** In FY 2005, 1,205 workers used outplacement services at an average cost of \$1,642. Recipients may have separated in prior years.

**Educational Assistance.** In FY 2005, 376 workers received educational assistance at an average cost of \$1,611. Recipients may have separated in prior years.

## **3.5 SITE SUMMARIES**

### **3.5.1 Argonne National Laboratory**

#### **3.5.1.1 Background**

The Argonne National Laboratory (Argonne) is a large, multi-program laboratory operated by the University of Chicago for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). Argonne's mission is basic research and technology development to meet national goals in scientific leadership, energy technology, environmental quality, and national security. Argonne is located in Argonne, Illinois.

#### **3.5.1.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 87, with 21 voluntary and 66 involuntary. An additional 230 separations occurred through attrition (**Table 3-1**).

### 3.5.1.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$2,620,756 (Table 3-1).

**Table 3-1. Argonne National Laboratory Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

		Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$867,296</b>	<b>\$867,296</b>	<b>\$3,455</b>
	1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
	1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	21	0	867,296	867,296	41,300
	1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	230	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,565,387</b>	<b>1,565,387</b>	<b>23,718</b>
	2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	66	0	1,565,387	1,565,387	23,718
	2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	66	0	1,565,387	1,565,387	23,718
	2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
	2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,432,683</b>	<b>2,432,683</b>	<b>7,674</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	4	0	0	0	0
	4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
	4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>188,073</b>	<b>188,073</b>	<b>2,443</b>
	5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	54	0	175,473	175,473	3,250
	5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
	5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	23	0	12,600	12,600	548
	5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,620,756</b>	<b>\$2,620,756</b>	<b>\$6,585</b>

Note: Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

Key: DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

## 3.5.2 Brookhaven National Laboratory

### 3.5.2.1 Background

The Brookhaven National Laboratory (Brookhaven) is a large, multi-program laboratory operated by Brookhaven Science Associates for DOE. Brookhaven conducts research in the physical, biomedical, and environmental sciences, as well as in energy technologies. Brookhaven is located in New York.

### 3.5.2.2 Current Work Force Restructuring

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 53, with 12 voluntary and 41 involuntary. An additional 196 separations occurred through attrition (Table 3–2).

### 3.5.2.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$1,648,120 (Table 3–2).

**Table 3–2. Brookhaven National Laboratory Work Force Restructuring Summary,  
Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$220,339</b>	<b>\$220,339</b>	<b>\$1,059</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	12	0	220,339	220,339	18,362
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	196	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,048,147</b>	<b>1,048,147</b>	<b>25,565</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	41	0	1,048,147	1,048,147	25,565
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	41	0	1,048,147	1,048,147	25,565
2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,268,486</b>	<b>1,268,486</b>	<b>5,094</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	10	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>379,634</b>	<b>379,634</b>	<b>7,593</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	50	0	379,634	379,634	7,593
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	0	0	0	0	0
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,648,120</b>	<b>\$1,648,120</b>	<b>\$5,334</b>

Note: Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

Key: DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.3 Fernald and Mound

#### 3.5.3.1 Background

The Fernald Closure Project (Fernald) is a former uranium-processing facility, which supported the Nation's defense program and is now undergoing environmental remediation. Fluor Fernald is managing Fernald's cleanup program. The Mound Closure Project (Mound) is a facility where nuclear research and design, development, manufacturing, and testing of nuclear weapons and spacecraft components were done. Mound is also undergoing environmental remediation. This effort is being managed by CH2M HILL Mound, Inc.

#### 3.5.3.2 Current Work Force Restructuring

##### FERNALD

In FY 2005, RIF separations at Fernald totaled 233, all involuntary. An additional 45 separations occurred through attrition (Table 3-3).

**Table 3-3. Fernald Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	0	0	0	0	0
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	45	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,432,651</b>	<b>4,432,651</b>	<b>19,024</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	233	0	4,432,651	4,432,651	19,024
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	233	0	4,432,651	4,432,651	19,024
2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,432,651</b>	<b>4,432,651</b>	<b>15,945</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	12	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>294,970</b>	<b>358,009</b>	<b>652,979</b>	<b>2,839</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	73	0	358,009	358,009	4,904
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	64	124,281	0	124,281	1,942
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	93	170,689	0	170,689	1,835
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>\$294,970</b>	<b>\$4,790,660</b>	<b>\$5,085,630</b>	<b>\$9,780</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

## MOUND

In FY 2005, RIF separations totaled 68, all involuntary (Table 3–4).

**Table 3–4. Mound Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	0	0	0	0	0
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,975,340</b>	<b>1,975,340</b>	<b>29,049</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	68	0	1,975,340	1,975,340	29,049
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	68	0	1,975,340	1,975,340	29,049
2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,975,340</b>	<b>1,975,340</b>	<b>29,049</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>146,113</b>	<b>74,554</b>	<b>220,667</b>	<b>673</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	45	0	74,554	74,554	1,657
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	6	16,952	0	16,952	2,825
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	234	64,818	0	64,818	277
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	43	64,343	0	64,343	1,496
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>\$146,113</b>	<b>\$2,049,894</b>	<b>\$2,196,007</b>	<b>\$5,545</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.3.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

#### FERNALD

The total work force restructuring cost incurred in FY 2005 was \$5,085,630 (Table 3–3).

#### MOUND

The total work force restructuring cost incurred in FY 2005 was \$2,196,007 (Table 3–4).

### 3.5.3.4 Community Transition

#### FERNALD

The Fernald Community Reuse Organization (CRO) was established in FY 1997 as the local CRO when initial planning activities began for development of a community economic development program. The CRO's main economic development thrust has been planning and development of a business incubator, the Ohio Biztech Center. The center received \$200,000 from the City of Hamilton Department of Economic Development and the Certified Development Company of Butler County to cover project startup and operational costs, in addition to funds received from the CRO.

As of September 30, 2005, a total of \$736,921 has been committed to the CRO; all funds are now spent (Table 3-5). Due to the planning nature of Fernald's current activities, no jobs were created.

**Table 3-5. Fernald Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

Fernald CRO FY 1997 through FY 2005						
Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
Startup/ planning grant <sup>a</sup>	\$736,921	\$0	\$736,921	\$736,921	0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$736,921</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$736,921</b>	<b>\$736,921</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

Key: CRO=community reuse organization; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year.

#### MOUND

The eventual closure of the Mound facility initiated new roles and responsibilities for DOE and led to establishment of the Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation (MMCIC). MMCIC is a not-for-profit corporation established by the City of Miamisburg in FY 1997 to redevelop and reuse the Mound site, as well as transfer its assets for reuse. MMCIC was chartered with the vision of establishing the site as an economically viable, privately owned technology and industry center called the Mound Advanced Technology Center by 2005. MMCIC is now focusing on commercialization of the Mound site. The mission of the partnership between DOE and the local community (represented by MMCIC) is to identify and assemble resources and capabilities needed to address impacts resulting from Mound's closure. The shared goal is to complete cleanup in a timely manner and help MMCIC achieve successful reuse of Mound.

As of September 30, 2005, over \$26.7 million has been committed to MMCIC, of which approximately \$20.4 million has been spent. A total of 608 jobs was created or retained (Table 3-6).



**Table 3-6. Mound Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

<b>MMCIC FY 1994 through FY 2005</b>						
<b>Project</b>	<b>3161 Funds Committed</b>	<b>Other DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Total DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Funds Spent</b>	<b>Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)</b>	<b>Cost per Job Created</b>
Building improvements and construction	\$7,981,127	\$0	\$7,981,127	\$5,495,719	0	\$0
Infrastructure improvements and construction	4,968,127	550,000	5,518,127	2,248,843	0	0
Site ownership	1,764,674	0	1,764,674	1,729,000	0	0
Facility management and leasing	6,372,529	0	6,372,529	6,338,000	608	10,424
Personal property management	570,000	0	570,000	570,000	0	0
Comprehensive reuse plan update	300,000	0	300,000	300,000	0	0
Marketing and public interface	1,624,433	0	1,624,433	1,431,741	0	0
Administration <sup>a</sup>	2,408,542	200,000	2,608,542	2,295,000	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$25,989,432</b>	<b>\$750,000</b>	<b>\$26,739,432</b>	<b>\$20,408,303</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>\$33,566</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year; MMCIC=Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation.

### **3.5.4 Hanford Site**

#### **3.5.4.1 Background**

The Hanford Site (Hanford), located in Washington State, is engaged in a massive environmental cleanup project dealing with accumulated chemical and radioactive wastes resulting from decades of plutonium production for the Nation's nuclear weapons program. Today, Hanford is one of the largest and most complex environmental cleanup efforts in the Nation, focusing on cleanup of the site's legacy Cold War wastes. The DOE Richland Operations Office (RL) and Office of River Protection (ORP) manage the site. Data reported include RL primary contractors Fluor Hanford, Inc.; Washington Closure Hanford (both with subcontractors); and AdvancedMed Hanford and ORP contractor CH2M HILL Hanford Group, Inc.

#### **3.5.4.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 745, with 169 voluntary and 576 involuntary. An additional 817 separations occurred through attrition (**Table 3-7**).

**Table 3–7. Hanford Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

		Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>986</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,896,056</b>	<b>\$2,896,056</b>	<b>\$2,937</b>
	1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
	1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	169	0	2,896,056	2,896,056	17,136
	1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	817	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,998,930</b>	<b>3,998,930</b>	<b>6,943</b>
	2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	228	0	3,998,930	3,998,930	17,539
	2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	228	0	3,998,930	3,998,930	17,539
	2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
	2.2 Without benefits	348	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>1,562</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,894,986</b>	<b>6,894,986</b>	<b>4,414</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	41	0	0	0	0
	4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
	4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>42,071</b>	<b>395,186</b>	<b>437,257</b>	<b>2,618</b>
	5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	151	0	395,186	395,186	2,617
	5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
	5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	0	0	0	0	0
	5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	16	42,071	0	42,071	2,629
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>1,770</b>	<b>\$42,071</b>	<b>\$7,290,172</b>	<b>\$7,332,243</b>	<b>\$4,143</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.4.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was **\$7,332,243** (Table 3–7).

### 3.5.4.4 Community Transition

In May 1994, economic development organizations within the Hanford area designated the Tri-City Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) as the Hanford CRO. TRIDEC evaluates and recommends proposals that will create and retain high-value jobs in the area. The CRO also reviews and makes recommendations on the prioritization of Hanford resources to be transferred to the community and serves as a communication link between the site and other interests or organizations.

As of September 30, 2005, nearly \$23.1 million has been committed to the CRO, and approximately \$21.9 million has been spent. A total of 10,247 jobs has been created or retained (**Table 3–8**).

**Table 3–8. Hanford Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

TRIDEC FY 1994 through FY 2005						
Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
Infrastructure	\$4,991,000	\$0	\$4,991,000	\$4,991,000	0	\$0
Financing programs	3,700,000	0	3,700,000	3,700,000	48	77,083
Community and marketing studies	1,727,814	0	1,727,814	1,727,814	0	0
Business development programs	4,854,860	132,000	4,986,860	4,986,860	1,096	4,550
Hanford reindustrialization	1,004,480	0	1,004,480	602,302	75	8,031
Minority program development TRIDEC	381,111	0	381,111	261,901	30	8,730
TRIDEC incentive fund	2,200,000	0	2,200,000	2,100,511	235	8,938
TRIDEC marketing	1,663,092	0	1,663,092	1,614,397	8,763	184
TRIDEC administration <sup>a</sup>	2,441,859	0	2,441,859	1,924,353	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$22,964,216</b>	<b>\$132,000</b>	<b>\$23,096,216</b>	<b>\$21,909,138</b>	<b>10,247</b>	<b>\$2,138</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

Key: DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year; TRIDEC=Tri-City Industrial Development Council.

### **3.5.5 Idaho National Laboratory**

#### **3.5.5.1 Background**

During FY 2005, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory was split into Idaho National Laboratory, the Idaho Cleanup Project, and the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project. Idaho National Laboratory is a science-based, nuclear energy national laboratory located in Idaho and operated by Battelle Energy Alliance, LLC, for DOE. The Idaho Cleanup Project is an environmental cleanup project located in Idaho and operated by CH2M-WG Idaho, LLC, for DOE. The Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project is also an environmental management cleanup project located in Idaho and operated by Bechtel BWXT Idaho, LLC, for DOE.

#### **3.5.5.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, there were no work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.5.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost**

In FY 2005, no costs were incurred related to work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.5.4 Community Transition**

The Eastern Idaho Community Reuse Organization (EICRO) was established in October 1994 to diversify the regional economy in eastern Idaho. EICRO accomplished this by creating the widest possible range of employment opportunities for the region's residents, while preserving and enhancing their quality of life. DOE provided \$30 million to the State of Idaho for economic development activities through a federal-court-mandated settlement agreement on the disposition of spent nuclear fuel. The state selected the Regional Development Alliance, Inc. (RDA), a nonprofit corporation, to receive and administer \$20.5 million of these funds and earmarked the remaining funds for other economic development projects. As of September 30, 2005, the state and the RDA have spent a total \$21 million and created 4,366 jobs. On January 1, 2004, RDA was designated as the CRO for Idaho and the former EICRO was dissolved.

As of September 30, 2005, nearly \$7.6 million has been committed to EICRO and the RDA CRO; all the funds are now spent. A total of 3,562 jobs was created or retained by these two CROs (**Table 3-9**).

**Table 3–9. Idaho National Laboratory Community Transition Funding and Job Creation  
by Project**

<b>EICRO/RDA FY 1995 through FY 2005</b>						
<b>Project</b>	<b>3161 Funds Committed</b>	<b>Other DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Total DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Funds Spent</b>	<b>Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)</b>	<b>Cost per Job Created</b>
FY 1995 planning grant <sup>a</sup>	\$325,000	\$0	\$325,000	\$325,000	0	\$0
Closed EICRO projects and administration	7,000,000	0	7,000,000	7,000,000	3,562	1,965
RDA entrepreneurial development	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	0	0
RDA business development	32,742	0	32,742	32,742	0	0
RDA marketing INL	32,742	0	32,742	32,742	0	0
RDA administration	134,516	0	134,516	134,516	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$7,575,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$7,575,000</b>	<b>\$7,575,000</b>	<b>3,562</b>	<b>\$2,127</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; EICRO=Eastern Idaho Community Reuse Organization; FY=fiscal year; INL=Idaho National Laboratory; RDA=Regional Development Alliance, Inc.

### **3.5.6 Kansas City Plant**

#### **3.5.6.1 Background**

The Kansas City Plant (KCP) is a National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) facility managed and operated by Honeywell Federal Manufacturing & Technologies (FM&T), a division of Honeywell International that produces many high-technology products for consumer and government use. KCP is responsible for the development, procurement, and production of nonnuclear components for the Nation's nuclear weapons program. In addition to production capabilities, the KCP also provides technical support services for national laboratories and government agencies. These services include laboratory testing and analysis, training program development, and vehicle safeguarding. Honeywell FM&T employs more than 3,000 associates at facilities in Kansas City, Missouri; Albuquerque and Los Alamos, New Mexico; and Ft. Chaffee, Arkansas.

#### **3.5.6.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 15, all involuntary. An additional 163 separations occurred through attrition (**Table 3-10**).

**Table 3–10. Kansas City Plant Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	0	0	0	0	0
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	163	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>224,395</b>	<b>224,395</b>	<b>14,960</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	15	0	224,395	224,395	14,960
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	15	0	224,395	224,395	14,960
2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>224,395</b>	<b>224,395</b>	<b>1,261</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>2,000</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	0	0	0	0	0
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	3	0	6,000	6,000	2,000
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$230,395</b>	<b>\$230,395</b>	<b>\$1,273</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.6.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$230,395 (Table 3–10).



### **3.5.7 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

#### **3.5.7.1 Background**

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), one of three research laboratories managed by the University of California, is a national security laboratory whose mission is to solve complex scientific and technical problems of national importance. LLNL has facilities in California and Nevada.

#### **3.5.7.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

There were no work force restructuring activities in FY 2005.

#### **3.5.7.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost**

In FY 2005, no costs were incurred related to work force restructuring activities.

### **3.5.8 Los Alamos National Laboratory**

#### **3.5.8.1 Background**

The University of California manages Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) for DOE. LANL is located in New Mexico and is one of the largest multidisciplinary research institutions in the world. Its mission includes enhancing global security by using science and engineering to ensure the safety, reliability, and performance of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and by helping reduce threats to U.S. security, with a focus on weapons of mass destruction. LANL is also involved in cleaning up the legacy of the Cold War, as well as providing technical solutions to energy, environment, and health problems.

#### **3.5.8.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, there were no work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.8.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost**

In FY 2005, no costs were incurred related to work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.8.4 Community Transition**

In 1996, DOE recognized the nonprofit Regional Development Corporation (RDC) as the CRO for northern New Mexico community transition activities. RDC's strategy is to build upon cluster-based economic development sectors. To address specific community challenges, RDC initiates and implements projects that are community-specific, regional and/or statewide in scope, and add long-term value to the regional economy. RDC has looked for new means of support and now has contracts with LANL, Los Alamos County, and the New Mexico Department of Transportation through the University of New Mexico. RDC was recently awarded a contract with the New Mexico Economic Development Department.

As of September 30, 2005, nearly \$13.7 million has been committed to RDC, of which approximately \$13.6 million has been spent. A total of 1,700 jobs was created or retained (**Table 3-11**).

**Table 3–11. Los Alamos National Laboratory Community Transition Funding  
and Job Creation by Project**

<b>RDC FY 1993 through FY 2005</b>						
<b>Project</b>	<b>3161 Funds Committed</b>	<b>Other DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Total DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Funds Spent</b>	<b>Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)</b>	<b>Cost per Job Created</b>
RDC: Closed infrastructure grants	\$6,229,883	\$0	\$6,229,883	\$6,229,883	595	\$10,470
RDC: Closed business development grants	1,693,750	0	1,693,750	1,693,750	647	2,618
RDC: Closed agriculture grants	770,502	0	770,502	770,502	41	18,793
RDC: Closed work force development	830,774	0	830,774	830,774	135	6,154
Connect Rio Arriba	121,804	0	121,804	121,804	5	24,361
NM BIZ Sites	209,000	0	209,000	209,000	250	836
RDC administrative <sup>a</sup>	2,148,593	0	2,148,593	2,054,111	0	0
<b>DATF and RDC Totals</b>	<b>12,004,306</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,004,306</b>	<b>11,909,824</b>	<b>1,673</b>	<b>7,119</b>
<b>DOE-Originated Grant Totals</b>	<b>821,900</b>	<b>860,381</b>	<b>1,682,281</b>	<b>1,679,933</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>62,220</b>
<b>Northern New Mexico Project Totals</b>	<b>\$12,826,206</b>	<b>\$860,381</b>	<b>\$13,686,587</b>	<b>\$13,589,757</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>\$7,994</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** BIZ=business; DATF=Defense Adjustment Task Force; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year; NM=New Mexico; RDC=Regional Development Corporation.

### **3.5.9 Nevada Test Site**

#### **3.5.9.1 Background**

Established as the Atomic Energy Commission's on-continent proving ground, the Nevada Test Site (NTS) has seen more than four decades of nuclear weapons testing. Since the nuclear weapons testing moratorium in 1992, test site use has diversified under DOE's direction into many other programs, such as hazardous chemical spill testing, emergency response training, conventional weapons testing, and waste management and environmental technology studies. NTS, located in Nevada, is managed and operated for DOE by Bechtel Nevada.

#### **3.5.9.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 115, all involuntary. An additional 298 separations occurred through attrition (**Table 3-12**).

**Table 3–12. Nevada Test Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	0	0	0	0	0
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	298	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>425,339</b>	<b>425,339</b>	<b>3,699</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	33	0	425,339	425,339	12,889
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	33	0	425,339	425,339	12,889
2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
2.2 Without benefits	82	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>425,339</b>	<b>425,339</b>	<b>1,030</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	7	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	11	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>241,424</b>	<b>241,424</b>	<b>6,706</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	36	0	241,424	241,424	6,706
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	0	0	0	0	0
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$666,763</b>	<b>\$666,763</b>	<b>\$1,428</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.9.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$666,763 (Table 3–12).

### 3.5.9.4 Community Transition

The Nevada Test Site Development Corporation (NTSDC) was designated as the CRO in June 1995 to partner with DOE for community transition and commercialization efforts in the NTS area. This nonprofit entity facilitates development of sustainable private commercial activities that maximize use of DOE resources and contributes to high-value job creation. NTSDC also adds long-term value to the regional economy by expanding nongovernmental business opportunities.

As of September 30, 2005, nearly \$15.9 million has been committed to NTSDC, all of which is now spent. A total of 2,728 jobs was created or retained (Table 3–13).

**Table 3–13. Nevada Test Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

NTSDC FY 1995 through FY 2005						
Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
<b>Closed Projects</b>						
Fluid Tech	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	13	\$23,077
Aerospace	494,139	0	494,139	494,139	0	0
WG Squared	1,383	0	1,383	1,383	3	461
Dessert Sky Rock	193,796	0	193,796	193,796	0	0
Lincoln County RDC & Partnerships	337,818	0	337,818	337,818	1	337,818
Science & Technology, RDC	444,950	0	444,950	444,950	0	0
NRG Technologies, Inc.	661,173	0	661,173	661,173	6	110,196
Esmeralda County EDC	32,000	0	32,000	32,000	0	0
Barth Electronics	2,055	0	2,055	2,055	0	0
Environmental Sources NV	1,005	0	1,005	1,005	0	0
Hellonetwork	450	0	450	450	0	0
Next-Generation Power	71,871	0	71,871	71,871	0	0
Communications systems for state EDAs	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	755	132
Corporation for Solar Technologies and Renewable Resources	2,731,891	532,417	3,264,308	3,264,308	6	544,051
Implementation	4,984,416	100,000	5,084,416	5,084,416	1,808	2,812
Loan program	496,588	0	496,588	496,588	26	19,100
Incubator program	528,356	0	528,356	528,356	20	26,418
Hydrogen-Enriched Vehicle Grant	250,000	0	250,000	250,000	6	41,667
IBT/NTS Training Center	1,236,000	0	1,236,000	1,236,000	84	14,714
Establish and start up CRO <sup>a</sup>	520,000	0	520,000	520,000	0	0
Administration <sup>a</sup>	1,850,000	0	1,850,000	1,850,000	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$15,237,891</b>	<b>\$632,417</b>	<b>\$15,870,308</b>	<b>\$15,870,308</b>	<b>2,728</b>	<b>\$5,818</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** CRO=community reuse organization; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; EDA=Economic Development Agency; EDC=Economic Development Council; FY=fiscal year; IBT=International Brotherhood of Teamsters; NTS=Nevada Test Site; NTSDC=Nevada Test Site Development Corporation; NV=Nevada; RDC=Regional Development Corporation.

### 3.5.10 Oak Ridge Complex

#### 3.5.10.1 Background

The Oak Ridge Complex, located in Tennessee, spans the technology development continuum from purely basic science to full-scale production deployment capability. Program areas include environmental remediation, waste management, and assets utilization initiatives. The complex includes the East Tennessee Technology Park, Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Y-12 NNSA Complex. The complex provides a formidable resource for developing and deploying basic and applied research and production assistance for U.S. industry, national security goals, and restoration of areas environmentally impacted by decades of nuclear weapons activity.

#### 3.5.10.2 Current Work Force Restructuring

In FY 2005, RIF separations totaled 19, with 4 voluntary and 15 involuntary. An additional 456 separations occurred through attrition (Table 3–14).

**Table 3–14. Oak Ridge Complex Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$131,673</b>	<b>\$131,673</b>	<b>\$286</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	4	0	131,673	131,673	32,918
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	456	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>407,154</b>	<b>407,154</b>	<b>27,144</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	15	0	407,154	407,154	27,144
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	15	0	407,154	407,154	27,144
2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>538,827</b>	<b>538,827</b>	<b>1,134</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	204	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	14	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>112,399</b>	<b>27,031</b>	<b>139,430</b>	<b>456</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	16	0	27,031	27,031	1,689
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	289	110,201	0	110,201	381
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	1	2,198	0	2,198	2,198
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>999</b>	<b>\$112,399</b>	<b>\$565,858</b>	<b>\$678,257</b>	<b>\$679</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.10.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

The total work force restructuring cost incurred in FY 2005 at the Oak Ridge Complex was **\$678,257** (Table 3–14).

### 3.5.10.4 Community Transition

The Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee (CROET) was established in November 1995, replacing the East Tennessee Economic Council as the local CRO. CROET is a nonprofit economic development organization that assists the private sector in creating quality jobs in the region by using the underutilized land, facilities, equipment, personnel, and technologies available at DOE's K-25 plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee (Heritage Center). As the CRO for the region, CROET is the community's primary liaison to DOE for community transition issues. It continues to be involved in leasing agreements that encourage reindustrialization of the East Tennessee Technology Park (Heritage Center and Horizon Center) and fosters economic development in the affected communities through federal grants.

As of September 30, 2005, nearly \$58.3 million has been committed to the CRO and the management and operating contractor; all funds are spent. A total of 8,924 jobs was created or retained (Table 3–15).

**Table 3–15. Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee Community Transition  
Funding and Job Creation by Project**

CROET FY 1994 through FY 2005						
Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
Training	\$18,052,000	\$0	\$18,052,000	\$18,052,000	3,023	\$5,972
Land, facilities, and research and development assistance	36,699,500	0	36,699,500	36,699,500	5,401	6,795
Planning/program management <sup>a</sup>	1,250,000	0	1,250,000	1,250,000	0	0
New business development – DOE small business grant	2,000,000	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	500	4,000
FY 2004 operations grant <sup>a</sup>	288,000	0	288,000	288,000	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$58,289,500</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$58,289,500</b>	<b>\$58,289,500</b>	<b>8,924</b>	<b>\$6,532</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** CROET=Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year.



### **3.5.11 Paducah and Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plants**

#### **3.5.11.1 Background**

##### **PADUCAH**

The Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Paducah), located in Kentucky, began production of enriched uranium in 1952. The Paducah site's mission includes environmental cleanup and waste management; the Enrichment Facilities' mission includes management of depleted uranium hexafluoride generated prior to July 1993 and maintenance of nonleased buildings and grounds. The primary contractors for DOE activities at the Paducah site include Paducah Remediation Services (remediation contractor), Swift and Staley (infrastructure contractor), Uranium Disposition Services, and the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC).

##### **PORTSMOUTH**

The Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Portsmouth), built in the 1950s in Ohio, was needed to provide uranium-235 at rates substantially above those of the existing production facilities located in Tennessee and in Paducah, Kentucky. Portsmouth was chosen in the late 1970s as the site for a new enrichment facility using gas centrifuge technology. Construction, however, was halted in 1985 because demand for enriched uranium decreased, and laser technology promised a more efficient and economical supply of enriched uranium for the future. In May 2001, production of enriched uranium at Portsmouth, through the gaseous diffusion process, ceased. USEC selected the Portsmouth site as the location for its American Centrifuge Demonstration Facility and American Centrifuge Plant in December 2002 and January 2004, respectively. Primary contractors for DOE activities at the Portsmouth site include LATA/Parallax Portsmouth, LLC (remediation contractor), ThetaPro2Serve (infrastructure contractor), Uranium Disposition Services, and USEC.

#### **3.5.11.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled five, all involuntary. An additional five separations occurred through attrition (**Table 3-16**).

**Table 3–16. Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Work Force Restructuring Summary,  
Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	0	0	0	0	0
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	5	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55,891</b>	<b>55,891</b>	<b>11,178</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	5	0	55,891	55,891	11,178
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	5	0	55,891	55,891	11,178
2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55,891</b>	<b>55,891</b>	<b>5,589</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>41,010</b>	<b>32,454</b>	<b>73,464</b>	<b>4,898</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	7	21,459	32,454	53,913	7,702
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	1	5,000	0	5,000	5,000
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	0	0	0	0	0
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	7	14,551	0	14,551	2,079
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>\$41,010</b>	<b>\$88,345</b>	<b>\$129,355</b>	<b>\$5,174</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

## PORTSMOUTH

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 32, all involuntary. An additional 49 separations occurred through attrition (Table 3–17).

**Table 3–17. Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant Work Force Restructuring Summary,  
Fiscal Year 2005**

		<b>Number of Workers</b>	<b>Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)</b>	<b>Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs</b>	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>Total Cost per Recipient</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
	1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	0	0	0	0	0
	1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	49	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>179,956</b>	<b>179,956</b>	<b>5,624</b>
	2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	27	0	179,956	179,956	6,665
	2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	27	0	179,956	179,956	6,665
	2.1.2 Construction workers	0	0	0	0	0
	2.2 Without benefits	5	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>179,956</b>	<b>179,956</b>	<b>2,222</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
	4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
	4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>56,496</b>	<b>9,812</b>	<b>66,308</b>	<b>1,411</b>
	5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	22	2,949	9,812	12,761	580
	5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
	5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	0	0	0	0	0
	5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	25	53,547	0	53,547	2,142
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>\$56,496</b>	<b>\$189,768</b>	<b>\$246,264</b>	<b>\$1,924</b>

**Note:** Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.11.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

#### PADUCAH

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$129,355 (Table 3–16).

#### PORTSMOUTH

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$246,264 (Table 3–17).

### 3.5.11.4 Community Transition

#### PADUCAH

The Paducah-Area Community Reuse Organization (PACRO) was established in August 1997 to mitigate effects of DOE work force restructuring at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky. The PACRO impact area was designed to represent counties where the majority of the Paducah work force lives: McCracken, Ballard, Graves, and Marshall Counties in western Kentucky and Massac County in southern Illinois. An Executive Committee representing such areas as business, labor, education, and economic development from impacted counties governs PACRO.

As of September 30, 2005, a total of \$10.35 million has been committed to PACRO, of which nearly \$10.2 million has been spent. A total of 1,722 jobs was created or retained (Table 3–18).

**Table 3–18. Paducah Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**  
PACRO FY 1997 through FY 2005

Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
FY 1998 planning grant	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000	\$400,000	0	\$0
Entrepreneurial development	536,625	0	536,625	536,625	72	7,453
Facility reuse	214,992	0	214,992	214,992	11	19,545
Industrial parks, sites, and spec. buildings:						
Regional park	1,466,175	0	1,466,175	1,392,458	0	0
Sites	2,872,482	0	2,872,482	2,872,482	763	3,765
Spec. buildings	2,787,359	0	2,787,359	2,787,359	187	14,906
Regional marketing	165,000	0	165,000	161,097	0	0
Work force reuse	286,685	0	286,685	282,000	363	777
Existing business and industry	161,899	0	161,899	161,899	326	497
Administration <sup>a</sup>	1,458,783	0	1,458,783	1,389,464	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$10,350,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,350,000</b>	<b>\$10,198,376</b>	<b>1,722</b>	<b>\$5,922</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

Key: DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year; PACRO=Paducah-Area Community Reuse Organization.

#### PORTSMOUTH

The Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative (SODI) was incorporated in July 1997 to serve as the CRO for the DOE Portsmouth site in Piketon, Ohio. Prior to incorporation, a \$500,000 planning grant was awarded to the Ohio Valley Regional Development Commission for community transition activities. SODI operated under the auspices of the commission from February 1996 until DOE implementation funds were awarded in 1998.

As of September 30, 2005, approximately \$14.5 million has been committed to SODI, of which nearly \$12.5 million has been spent. A total of 1,332 jobs was created or retained (Table 3–19).

**Table 3–19. Portsmouth Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

<b>SODI FY 1996 through FY 2005</b>						
<b>Project</b>	<b>3161 Funds Committed</b>	<b>Other DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Total DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Funds Spent</b>	<b>Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)</b>	<b>Cost per Job Created</b>
Zahn's Corner	\$3,109,556	\$0	\$3,109,556	\$2,835,000	588	\$4,821
New Boston Industrial Park	2,550,000	0	2,550,000	2,550,000	170	15,000
Worker training facility/program	500,000	0	500,000	161,009	0	0
Gateway Industrial Park	1,150,000	0	1,150,000	1,150,000	90	12,778
Reuse	250,000	0	250,000	250,000	90	2,778
Enterprise Training and Development	1,200,000	0	1,200,000	870,000	130	6,692
Incubator Facility	285,000	0	285,000	285,000	35	8,143
Business Seed Fund	325,000	0	325,000	325,000	34	9,559
Regional marketing	200,000	0	200,000	200,000	0	0
EM training	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	0
Intermodal Facility	25,444	0	25,444	25,444	0	0
Administration <sup>a</sup>	1,919,000	0	1,919,000	840,954	0	0
Closed projects	975,000	0	975,000	975,000	135	7,222
Closed planning studies	1,930,000	0	1,930,000	1,930,000	60	32,167
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$14,519,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$14,519,000</b>	<b>\$12,497,407</b>	<b>1,332</b>	<b>\$9,382</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; EM=environmental management; FY=fiscal year; SODI=Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative.

### **3.5.12 Pantex Plant**

#### **3.5.12.1 Background**

The Pantex Plant (Pantex) is charged with maintaining the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile by providing the capabilities to assemble nuclear and nonnuclear components into nuclear weapons, disassemble retired nuclear weapons, and perform surveillance activities. The facility, located in Texas, is managed and operated for NNSA by BWXT Pantex, a limited liability enterprise of BWX Technologies and Honeywell.

#### **3.5.12.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, there were no work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.12.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost**

In FY 2005, no costs were incurred related to work force restructuring activities.

### 3.5.13 Pinellas Plant

#### 3.5.13.1 Community Transition

In August 1993, the Tampa Bay community formed a task force consisting of organizations interested in mitigating possible adverse consequences of closing the former DOE Pinellas weapons plant and committed to utilizing its resources to help maintain technologies developed at the plant. The original stakeholder structure evolved into the Pinellas Plant CRO, which was established by DOE in January 1995.

As of September 30, 2005, just over \$26 million has been committed to the Pinellas Plant CRO and nearly \$23 million has been spent. A total of 3,321 jobs was created or retained (**Table 3–20**).

**Table 3–20. Pinellas Plant Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

Pinellas Plant CRO FY 1994 through FY 2005						
Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
Community stakeholder planning <sup>a</sup>	\$400,000	\$100,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	0	\$0
Innovation Commercialization Program	587,000	0	587,000	587,000	450	1,304
Pinellas Plant sale	17,592,900	0	17,592,900	14,234,000	2,533	5,619
Pinellas Plant seed projects	1,275,000	0	1,275,000	1,275,000	54	23,611
Pinellas Plant spinoffs	200,000	0	200,000	200,000	9	22,222
Seed/challenge funds	579,700	0	579,700	579,700	15	38,647
Suncoast Manufacturing Technology Center	334,700	0	334,700	334,700	125	2,678
Technology Deployment Center	4,388,000	0	4,388,000	4,388,000	87	50,437
STAR TEC	250,000	0	250,000	250,000	48	5,208
CRO administration <sup>a</sup>	510,300	0	510,300	251,900	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$26,117,600</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>	<b>\$26,217,600</b>	<b>\$22,600,300</b>	<b>3,321</b>	<b>\$6,805</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** CRO=community reuse organization; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year; STAR TEC=Science, Technology, and Research Technology Enterprise Center.

### 3.5.14 Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

#### 3.5.14.1 Background

The Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS), located in Colorado, is an environmental cleanup site managed by Kaiser-Hill Company, LLC, and its team of major subcontractors. Originally established as a nuclear weapons production facility, the RFETS mission has now evolved to one of environmental cleanup. It is designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as a Superfund Cleanup Site and is on the National Priorities List for cleanup. RFETS is scheduled for completion of physical cleanup by October 2005.

#### 3.5.14.2 Current Work Force Restructuring

In FY 2005, RIF separations (total separations minus attrition) totaled 967, all involuntary (Table 3–21).

**Table 3–21. Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

	Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0 Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	0	0	0	0	0
1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0 Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>967</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21,543,000</b>	<b>21,543,000</b>	<b>22,278</b>
2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	967	0	21,543,000	21,543,000	22,278
2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	964	0	21,521,000	21,521,000	22,325
2.1.2 Construction workers	3	0	22,000	22,000	7,333
2.2 Without benefits	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0 Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>967</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21,543,000</b>	<b>21,543,000</b>	<b>22,278</b>
<b>4.0 Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	39	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0 Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>1,025</b>	<b>1,997,493</b>	<b>1,649,000</b>	<b>3,646,493</b>	<b>3,558</b>
5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	214	0	1,649,000	1,649,000	7,706
5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	28	78,303	0	78,303	2,797
5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	592	1,661,000	0	1,661,000	2,806
5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	191	258,190	0	258,190	1,352
<b>6.0 Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>2,031</b>	<b>\$1,997,493</b>	<b>\$23,192,000</b>	<b>\$25,189,493</b>	<b>\$12,403</b>

Note: Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

Key: DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.



### 3.5.14.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

In FY 2005, the total work force restructuring cost incurred was \$25,189,493 (Table 3–21).

### 3.5.14.3 Community Transition

The Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments (Coalition) was established in February 1999 by an intergovernmental agreement among the seven local governments bordering RFETS and designated as the CRO for the Rocky Flats area in June 1999. The mission of the Coalition is to provide an effective vehicle for local governments and their citizens to work together on issues of mutual concern relating to the safe, prompt, and effective cleanup and closure of the Rocky Flats site. The Coalition addresses future use and long-term worker and environmental protection and health issues. The Coalition facilitates communication between state and federal agencies and elected officials.

As of September 30, 2005, \$1.3 million has been committed to the CRO; all funds are now spent (Table 3–22). Due to the planning nature of Rocky Flats' current activities, no jobs were created.

**Table 3–22. Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

<b>Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments FY 1999 through FY 2005</b>						
<b>Project</b>	<b>3161 Funds Committed</b>	<b>Other DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Total DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Funds Spent</b>	<b>Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)</b>	<b>Cost per Job Created</b>
Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments operations <sup>a</sup>	\$1,300,000	\$0	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,300,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,300,000</b>	<b>\$1,300,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for planning or administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

Key: DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year.

### **3.5.15 Sandia National Laboratories**

#### **3.5.15.1 Background**

Sandia National Laboratories (Sandia) is one of the largest research and development facilities in the Nation. Scientific and engineering solutions are provided at Sandia to meet national needs in nuclear weapons and related defense systems, energy security, and environmental integrity and to address emerging national challenges for both government and industry. Sandia, with facilities in California and New Mexico, is managed and operated by Sandia Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Lockheed Martin Corporation.

#### **3.5.15.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, there were no work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.15.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost**

In FY 2005, no costs were incurred related to work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.15.4 Community Transition**

##### **ALBUQUERQUE**

In May 1998, DOE first funded the City of Albuquerque to conduct a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis to assist with possible job losses resulting from a downsizing at Sandia. The Business Technology Group was established in January 1999 to serve as the CRO for central New Mexico. In December 1999, the Next-Generation Economy Initiative was created, which later evolved into Next-Generation Economy, Inc. (NextGen). NextGen was designated as the CRO for central New Mexico in September 2000.

As of September 30, 2005, approximately \$2.9 million has been committed to the CRO, all of which is spent. A total of 689 jobs has been created or retained (**Table 3–23**).

**Table 3–23. Albuquerque Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

Next Generation FY 1998 through FY 2005						
Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
Business Technology Group <sup>a</sup>	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	73	\$1,370
City of Albuquerque <sup>b</sup>	341,984	0	341,984	341,984	0	0
Science and Tech. Park Master Plan	150,000	0	150,000	150,000	597	251
Cluster Research and Communication	45,000	0	45,000	45,000	0	0
Entrepreneurial leadership	14,311	0	14,311	14,311	0	0
Technology Cluster Development	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	0
NextJobNM	267,297	0	267,297	267,297	0	0
CRO administration <sup>c</sup>	1,283,712	0	1,283,712	1,283,712	0	0
Style New Mexico	103,727	0	103,727	103,727	0	0
Microsystems Fabrication Facility	588,000	0	588,000	588,000	19	30,947
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$2,909,031</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,909,031</b>	<b>\$2,909,031</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>\$4,222</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds were used for strategic planning purposes.

<sup>b</sup> Funds were used to finance a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis. Remaining funds were de-obligated by the City of Albuquerque and returned to operating fund.

<sup>c</sup> Funds were used for administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** CRO=community reuse organization; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year; NM=New Mexico.

#### **EIGHT NORTHERN INDIAN PUEBLOS COUNCIL, INC.**

On April 27, 2000, DOE designated the Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council, Inc. (ENIPC) a CRO. DOE recognized that the Eight Northern Indian Pueblos are important players for continued economic and social development in northern New Mexico. The Pueblos's historical presence, locale to LANL, and sovereign status as federally recognized tribes are vital to economic success of the region. Pueblos represented by ENIPC include Nambé, Picuris, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, San Juan, Santa Clara, Taos, and Tesuque, all of which are located north of Santa Fe, New Mexico. ENIPC focuses on economic development strategies that identify and articulate each of the individual tribal cultures, institutions, and approaches to governance. The goal of ENIPC is to develop a collaborative regional community transition plan for all of the Eight Northern Indian Pueblos.

As of September 30, 2005, a total of \$672,716 has been committed to and spent by ENIPC. Due to the planning nature of ENIPC's current activities, no jobs were created (**Table 3–24**).

**Table 3–24. Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council Community Reuse Organization Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

<b>ENIPC FY 2000 through FY 2005</b>						
<b>Project</b>	<b>3161 Funds Committed</b>	<b>Other DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Total DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Funds Spent</b>	<b>Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)</b>	<b>Cost per Job Created</b>
SWOT analysis <sup>a</sup>	\$116,600	\$0	\$116,600	\$116,600	0	\$0
Individual tribal planning assessments	140,000	0	140,000	140,000	0	0
Business feasibility studies <sup>a</sup>	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	0
Physical Infrastructure and Market Characteristics Report assessments <sup>a</sup>	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	0	0
Labor force assessment <sup>a</sup>	35,000	0	35,000	35,000	0	0
Student interns 2003	8,050	0	8,050	8,050	0	0
CRO administration <sup>a</sup>	223,066	0	223,066	223,066	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$672,716</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$672,716</b>	<b>\$672,716</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** CRO=community reuse organization; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; ENIPC=Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council, Inc.; FY=fiscal year; SWOT=strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

### **3.5.16 Savannah River Site**

#### **3.5.16.1 Background**

The Savannah River Site (SRS) is located in South Carolina and operated by Washington Savannah River Company, LLC. SRS focuses on environmental stewardship, which involves management, treatment, and disposal of radioactive and nonradioactive wastes from past, present, and future operations; pollution prevention and restoration of the environment impacted by site operations; management of excess nuclear materials, including transportation, stabilization, storage, and disposition to support nuclear nonproliferation initiatives; and nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship, emphasizing a science-based approach.

#### **3.5.16.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, reduction-in-force separations totaled 1,283, with 625 voluntary and 658 involuntary. An additional 254 separations occurred through attrition (**Table 3-25**).

**Table 3–25. Savannah River Site Work Force Restructuring Summary, Fiscal Year 2005**

		Number of Workers	Enhanced Costs Funded by LM (Section 3161)	Program Costs Funded by Other DOE Programs	Total Costs	Total Cost per Recipient
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Voluntary Separations (lines 1.1 + 1.2 + 1.3)</b>	<b>879</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$17,350,583</b>	<b>\$17,350,583</b>	<b>\$19,739</b>
	1.1 Early retirement	0	0	0	0	0
	1.2 Nonretirement voluntary separations (costs = severance)	625	0	17,350,583	17,350,583	27,761
	1.3 Attrition (includes normal retirement)	254	0	0	0	0
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Involuntary Separations (lines 2.1 + 2.2) (costs = severance)</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>7,352</b>	<b>10,750,341</b>	<b>10,757,693</b>	<b>16,349</b>
	2.1 With benefits (lines 2.1.1 + 2.1.2)	568	7,352	10,750,341	10,757,693	18,940
	2.1.1 Nonconstruction workers	560	0	10,750,341	10,750,341	19,197
	2.1.2 Construction workers	8	7,352	0	7,352	919
	2.2 Without benefits	90	0	0	0	0
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Total Separations and Costs (lines 1.0 + 2.0)</b>	<b>1,537</b>	<b>7,352</b>	<b>28,100,924</b>	<b>28,108,276</b>	<b>18,288</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Other Affected Workers (lines 4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3)</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	4.1 Workers placed internally without retraining (same site and company)	369	0	0	0	0
	4.2 Workers placed internally through retraining programs (same site and company)	0	0	0	0	0
	4.3 Workers transferred to other DOE sites (same or different company)	65	0	0	0	0
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Other Benefits Provided (lines 5.1 + 5.2 + 5.3 + 5.4)</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>203,724</b>	<b>203,724</b>	<b>1,405</b>
	5.1 Displaced worker medical benefits	145	0	203,724	203,724	1,405
	5.2 Relocation assistance to other DOE sites	0	0	0	0	0
	5.3 Separating or separated workers using outplacement	0	0	0	0	0
	5.4 Educational assistance for separated workers	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Totals for Fiscal Year 2005 (lines 3.0 + 4.0 + 5.0)</b>	<b>2,116</b>	<b>\$7,352</b>	<b>\$28,304,648</b>	<b>\$28,312,000</b>	<b>\$13,380</b>

Note: Total separations = line 3.0. Reduction-in-force separations = total separations (line 3.0) minus attrition (line 1.3).

Key: DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; LM=Office of Legacy Management.

### 3.5.16.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost

The total work force restructuring cost incurred in FY 2005 at SRS was \$28,312,000 (Table 3–25).

### 3.5.16.4 Community Transition

The Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative (SRRDI) is the CRO for SRS and was created by Congress in November 1993. SRRDI is a nonprofit organization run by a board of directors appointed by local governments, chambers of commerce, and members of the South Carolina and Georgia congressional delegations. SRRDI's overall objective is to create an environment conducive to technology-based business startups and expansions and to attract new ventures to the SRRDI region. Through its efforts, SRRDI helps diversify the region's economic base; create and retain high-value, long-term private-sector jobs; and transfer SRS technologies to new and existing area firms for commercial application.

As of FY 2005, a total of \$53.6 million has been committed to the SRS Operations Office, the management and operating contractor, the CRO, and other economic development associations. Nearly \$53.1 million of this total has been spent. A total of 6,509 jobs was created or retained (Table 3–26). SRRDI was allotted \$13.6 million; of this amount, \$13.1 million has been spent. SRRDI created 4,178 of the total jobs created.

**Table 3–26. Savannah River Site Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

SRRDI/SRS FY 1994 through FY 2005						
Project	3161 Funds Committed	Other DOE Funds Committed	Total DOE Funds Committed	Funds Spent	Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)	Cost per Job Created
<b>Active Projects</b>						
Venture/seed/challenge fund	\$1,525,000	\$0	\$1,525,000	\$1,225,000	8	\$153,125
SRRDI administrative projects	335,832	0	335,832	251,325	31	8,107
CRO administration <sup>a</sup>	1,821,284	1,017,165	2,838,449	2,723,597	0	0
Closed Marketing Projects	7,634,412	0	7,634,412	7,634,412	3,960	1,928
Closed Training Projects	1,304,797	0	1,304,797	1,304,797	179	7,289
<b>SRRDI Subtotal</b>	<b>12,621,325</b>	<b>1,017,165</b>	<b>13,638,490</b>	<b>13,139,131</b>	<b>4,178</b>	<b>3,145</b>
Savannah River Operations Office	1,450,000	8,848,251	10,298,251	10,298,251	1,034	9,960
Westinghouse SR Company	200,000	8,891,894	9,091,894	9,013,820	703	12,822
Tri-County economic development	8,400,000	200,000	8,600,000	8,600,000	594	14,478
SRS Centers of Excellence	0	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	0	0
<b>SRS Totals</b>	<b>\$22,671,325</b>	<b>\$30,957,310</b>	<b>\$53,628,635</b>	<b>\$53,051,202</b>	<b>6,509</b>	<b>\$8,150</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** CRO=community reuse organization; DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; FY=fiscal year; SR=Savannah River; SRRDI=Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative; SRS=Savannah River Site.

### **3.5.17 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**

#### **3.5.17.1 Background**

The Carlsbad Field Office, located in Carlsbad, New Mexico, was created to serve as the focal point for the Nation's transuranic (TRU) waste management efforts, as TRU waste is currently stored at many DOE sites across the country. The Carlsbad Field Office is responsible for managing the National Transuranic Waste Program, whose mission is the implementation and management of a national system that safely and cost-effectively provides for the certification, transportation, and disposal of defense-generated TRU waste. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is an integral part of the National Transuranic Waste Program and is managed by the Carlsbad Field Office. WIPP, near Carlsbad, is the Nation's only mined geologic repository for the permanent disposal of defense-generated TRU waste. The TRU waste, from all the generator sites that are eligible for disposal at WIPP, must ultimately be transported to this repository for receipt, handling, and disposal. WIPP is operated by Washington TRU Solutions, LLC, for DOE.

#### **3.5.17.2 Current Work Force Restructuring**

In FY 2005, there were no work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.17.3 Work Force Restructuring Cost**

In FY 2005, no costs were incurred related to work force restructuring activities.

#### **3.5.17.4 Community Transition**

In November 1998, DOE awarded a \$300,000 grant to the Carlsbad Department of Development to conduct a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis of southeast New Mexico. In June 2000, the Eddy/Lea Regional Commission was designated the CRO for this region to create new jobs and businesses to absorb current and future displaced DOE workers.

As of September 30, 2005, nearly \$4.4 million has been committed for community transition activities in southeast New Mexico and approximately \$3.9 million has been spent. A total of 1,496 jobs was created or retained (Table 3-27).



**Table 3-27. Carlsbad Community Transition Funding and Job Creation by Project**

<b>ELRC FY 1998 through FY 2005</b>						
<b>Project</b>	<b>3161 Funds Committed</b>	<b>Other DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Total DOE Funds Committed</b>	<b>Funds Spent</b>	<b>Jobs Created or Retained (Reported)</b>	<b>Cost per Job Created</b>
<b>Closed Projects</b>						
Advanced Manufacturing and Training Center	\$1,945,000	\$0	\$1,945,000	\$1,945,000	600	\$3,242
SWOT analysis	550,000	0	550,000	550,000	0	0
GIS	250,000	243,314	493,314	493,314	0	0
Targeted Auto Market Study	4,000	0	4,000	4,000	0	0
Oil-Field-Produced Water Study	236,000	0	236,000	236,000	5	47,200
Student interns	11,000	0	11,000	11,000	0	0
<b>Active Projects</b>						
Artesia Main Street and Marketing Study	200,000	0	200,000	55,000	521	106
Lea County Business Attraction and Beautification	120,000	0	120,000	69,995	170	412
National Cave and Karst Research Institute	200,000	0	200,000	62,116	4	15,529
Tatum Speculative Building	100,000	0	100,000	95,000	7	13,571
Hobbs Brownfield	83,333	0	83,333	0	0	0
Artesia Industrial Park/training promotion	56,667	0	56,667	21,500	189	114
Administrative staffing <sup>a</sup>	400,000	0	400,000	400,000	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$4,156,000</b>	<b>\$243,314</b>	<b>\$4,399,314</b>	<b>\$3,942,925</b>	<b>1,496</b>	<b>\$2,636</b>

<sup>a</sup> Funds used for administrative purposes. Job creation not intended.

**Key:** DOE=U.S. Department of Energy; ELRC=Eddy/Lea Regional Commission; FY=fiscal year; GIS=geographic information system; SWOT=strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.